

1 MCGREGOR W. SCOTT
2 United States Attorney
3 Assistant United States Attorney
2500 Tulare Street
Suite 4401
Fresno, California 93721
4 Telephone: (559) 497-4000
Facsimile: (559) 497-4099
5

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff
7 United States of America
8

9
10 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11
12 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

14 Plaintiff,

v.

15 GARY LEE BRIGGS,

16 Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:20-CR-00041 NONE-SKO

17 STIPULATION REGARDING EXCLUDABLE
18 TIME PERIODS UNDER SPEEDY TRIAL ACT;
19 FINDINGS AND ORDER

20 PROPOSED DATE: October 19, 2020

21 TIME: 1:00 p.m.

22 COURT: Hon. Sheila K. Oberto

23
24 This case is set for a status conference on August 17, 2020. This Court has issued General
Orders 611-620 to address public health concerns related to COVID-19, including the temporary
suspension of jury trials and restrictions on access to court buildings. Initially the Fresno courthouse
was closed through June 15, 2020, but it has since been closed until further notice.

25 Although the General Orders address district-wide health concerns, the Supreme Court has
26 emphasized that the Speedy Trial Act's end-of-justice provision "counteract[s] substantive open-
27 endedness with procedural strictness," "demand[ing] on-the-record findings" in a particular case. *Zedner*
28 *v. United States*, 547 U.S. 489, 509 (2006). "[W]ithout on-the-record findings, there can be no
exclusion under" § 3161(h)(7)(A). *Id.* at 507. And moreover, any such failure cannot be harmless. *Id.*
at 509; *see also United States v. Ramirez-Cortez*, 213 F.3d 1149, 1153 (9th Cir. 2000) (explaining that a
judge ordering an end-of-justice continuance must set forth explicit findings on the record "either
orally or in writing").

1 Based on the plain text of the Speedy Trial Act—which *Zedner* emphasizes as both mandatory
2 and inexcusable—the General Order requires specific supplementation. Ends-of-justice continuances
3 are excludable only if “the judge granted such continuance on the basis of his findings that the ends of
4 justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a
5 speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is excludable unless “the court sets
6 forth, in the record of the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or finding that the ends of justice
7 served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in
8 a speedy trial.” *Id.*

9 The General Orders exclude delay in the “ends of justice.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code
10 T4). Although the Speedy Trial Act does not directly address continuances stemming from pandemics,
11 natural disasters, or other emergencies, this Court has discretion to order a continuance in such
12 circumstances. For example, the Ninth Circuit affirmed a two-week ends-of-justice continuance
13 following Mt. St. Helens’ eruption. *Furlow v. United States*, 644 F.2d 764 (9th Cir. 1981). The court
14 recognized that the eruption made it impossible for the trial to proceed. *Id.* at 767-68; *see also United*
15 *States v. Correa*, 182 F. Supp. 326, 329 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (citing *Furlow* to exclude time following the
16 September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks and the resultant public emergency). The coronavirus is posing a
17 similar, albeit more enduring, barrier to the prompt proceedings mandated by the statutory rules.

18 In light of the societal context created by the foregoing, this Court should consider the following
19 case-specific facts in finding excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-
20 justice exception, § 3161(h)(7). When continued, this Court should designate a new date for the hearing.
21 *United States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any pretrial continuance must be
22 “specifically limited in time”).

STIPULATION

24 Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, and defendant, by and
25 through defendant's counsel of record, accordingly stipulate as follows:

26 1. By previous order this matter was set for a status conference hearing on August 17, 2020.
27 The Court more recently has invited a continuance of this hearing if counsel do not believe that anything
28 substantial can be accomplished at the currently scheduled hearing.

1 2. By this stipulation, the parties agree that the status conference be scheduled for October
2 19, 2020, and to exclude time between August 17, 2020, and October 19, 2020, under 18 U.S.C. §§
3 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (ii) and (iv).

4 3. The parties agree, and request that the Court find the following:

5 a) Counsel for defendant desires additional time to consult with his client, to review
6 the current charges and conduct further investigation and research related to the charges, to
7 discuss potential resolutions with his client, and to have discussion with the Fresno County
8 District Attorney about any possible state charge(s). In part this is because the government has
9 continued its investigation of the crimes, the government has provided discovery, and counsel
10 and the defendant will benefit from additional time to consider all relevant discovery material.

11 b) Counsel for defendant believes that failure to grant the above-requested
12 continuance would deny him the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into
13 account the exercise of due diligence.

14 c) The government does not object to the continuance and joins in the request.

15 d) In addition to the public health concerns cited by General Orders 611 and 612 and
16 presented by the evolving COVID-19 pandemic, an ends-of-justice delay is particularly apt in
17 this case because counsel or other relevant individuals have been encouraged to telework and
18 minimize personal contact to the greatest extent possible. It will be difficult to avoid personal
19 contact should the hearing proceed.

20 e) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the
21 case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the
22 original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

23 f) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the
24 case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the
25 original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

26 g) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161,
27 et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period from August 17, 2020, to October 19,
28 2020, inclusive, is deemed excludable under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(i),

1 (ii) and (iv) because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at the request of the
2 parties on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action
3 outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

4 4. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the
5 Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial
6 must commence.

7 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

8 Dated: August 11, 2020

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
McGREGOR W. SCOTT
United States Attorney

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
/s/ David Gappa

David L. Gappa
Assistant United States Attorney

13 Dated: August 11, 2020

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
/s/ John Meyer

(authorized on 8/7/20)
John Meyer
Counsel for Defendant
GARY LEE BRIGGS

FINDINGS AND ORDER

The court has reviewed and considered the stipulation that the parties filed on August 11, 2020.

Based on the reasons articulated in that filing, the court finds good cause to move the current status conference from August 17, 2020, to October 19, 2020, and to exclude time under the Speedy Trial Act under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), and (B)(iv), because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at defendant's request on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 12, 2020

181 Sheila K. Oberto

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE